DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 470 HE 023 533

AUTHOR Kendall, Jane C.
TITLE National Project To Strengthen Experiential Education in U.S. Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, Raleigh, NC.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 88
GRANT G008541032
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Consultants; *Delivery Systems; *Experiential Learning; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Instructional Effectiveness; Models; *Organizational Change; Postsecondary Education; *Teaching Methods; Workshops

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the 3-year project was to strengthen the role of experiential education as an accepted and effectively used way of teaching in a majority of postsecondary institutions and to make it available to a majority of future learners as part of the regular curriculum. Among specific objectives were assisting 160 colleges and universities to integrate experiential education into their missions and curricula; testing five models of institutional assistance, and helping campus-based advocates of experiential education to become more sophisticated in using principles of effective institutional change. The five different models of service delivery tested were: (1) on-site campus consultation; (2) regional or thematic workshops; (3) national workshop with individual consultation; (4) national workshop only; and (5) observer institutions. Project results included assistance to 454 schools. Three models of service delivery were found to be effective and feasible in helping schools institutionalize experiential education: on-site campus consultation, regional or thematic workshops, and national workshops. It was concluded that faculty involvement in experiential education is crucial for its integration into the higher education mainstream. Appended to the document are a final project evaluation and a list of the institutions that participated. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED320470

NATIONAL PROJECT

TO STRENGTHEN EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION

IN U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

GRANTEE ORGANIZATION	**National Society for Internships and Experiential Education** **3509 Haworth Drive, Suite 207** **Raleigh, NC 27609**
GRANT NUMBER	**G008541032**
PROJECT DATES	**Starting date: September 1, 1985** **Ending date: November 30, 1988** **No. of Months: 39 Months**
PROJECT DIRECTOR	**Jane C. Kendall** **Executive Director** **National Society for Internships and Experiential Education** **3509 Haworth Drive, Suite 207** **Raleigh, NC 27609** **Telephone: (919) 787-3263**
FUND PROGRAM OFFICER	**Jay Donahue**
GRANT AWARD	**Year 1: $ 77,675** **Year 2: $104,680** **Year 3: $113,388** **Total $295,743**

HE 023 533

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

NATIONAL PROJECT
TO STRENGTHEN EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION IN U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

I. PROJECT AND REPORT OVERVIEW

The National Project to Strengthen Experiential Education in U.S. Colleges and Universities was a three-year project to provide assistance to schools that are addressing critical issues in strengthening experiential education, such as integrating experiential education into their institutional missions and values, curricula, faculty work loads and teaching skills, faculty reward structures, administrative structures, budgets, and systems for quality assurance. Building upon the principles and techniques of the Pilot Project on Institutionalizing Experiential Education from 1983 to 1985, the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (NSIEE) experimented with five different models for service delivery, each requiring a different level of commitment of time and money by the participating schools. An important component of the program was to expand the number of trained consultants who could act as effective outside catalysts for institutionalization of experiential education.

The original proposal for the project stated that NSIEE would assist 160 schools over a three-year period in their efforts to strengthen experiential education within their institutions. Over 450 schools have actually been served by NSIEE through this project.

The results of the final evaluation of the project indicate that the institutions participating in all of the project's models made progress in institutionalizing experiential education on their campuses. The strongest finding from the evaluation is the need for greater faculty participation and recognition for those faculty who are already involved in using experiential education in their courses.

The results of the project will be of interest to higher education officials, academic administrators, faculty, experiential education professionals, and others interested in the processes of strengthening experiential education and of institutional change.

II. PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The broad purpose of the project is to strengthen the role of experiential education as an accepted and effectively used way of teaching in a majority of postsecondary institutions and to make it available to a majority of future learners as a part of the regular curriculum. The original objectives of the project were:

1. To assist 160 colleges and universities that were at a critical stage in integrating experiential education into their missions and curricula to move successfully toward this integration;

2. To build on our pilot efforts and the principles we have learned about the process of institutional change for improving teaching and learning;

3. To serve more schools in a cost-effective way by testing five models of institutional assistance and determining which models are feasible to continue after the grant period;

4. To increase the number and range of institutional and curricular models that demonstrate a commitment to active learning as a regular part of the instructional program, including the careful assessment of learning outcomes for students;

5. To help campus-based advocates of experiential education to become more sophisticated in using principles of effective institutional change;

6. To expand the pool of consultants trained to assist colleges and universities with institutionalizing experiential education, and

7. To disseminate the results to postsecondary schools and leaders in higher education across the country.

III. BACKGROUND AND ORIGINS

Founded in 1971, the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education is a non-profit educational association that supports the effective use of experience as an integral part of the learning process in all types of settings. Experiential education is defined here as learning that occurs through direct, active engagement in the phenomena being studied, coupled with considered reflection and synthesis. Experiential education can take a variety of forms of active learning, including internships, field studies, community and public service-learning, cooperative education, cross-cultural experiences, action research, and citizenship participation. NSIEE is concerned about students' intellectual and ethical development, their understanding of public and community responsibility, their career development, their cross-cultural awareness, and personal growth.

NSIEE was founded as a grassroots network of institutions and individuals involved in all forms of experiential education. It provides a wide range of services to educators and community leaders. NSIEE members come from colleges and universities, K-12 schools, non-profit organizations, government agencies, and businesses. The majority of members are college-based directors of experiential learning programs, faculty and department chairpersons, academic administrators, and student affairs and career development professionals.

From 1983 to 1985, NSIEE conducted a pilot project to provide assistance to twenty colleges and universities that were at critical junctures in strengthening experiential education. We learned a great deal about the process of effecting change within institutions, especially about change related to experiential education. Some of the principles of institutional change and intervention strategies we learned through the pilot effort that guided us in this project are:

1. Personal contact and exchange with an outside consultant helps the school officials, faculty, and experiential education professionals clarify the issues that need to be addressed in strengthening experiential education and in identifying strategies for accomplishing this goal on their campuses.

2. Reports and recommendations by a skilled consultant are very valuable in identifying what the next steps are for strengthening experiential education.

3. Institutional change is a slow and gradual process requiring continued advocacy. In addition, the institutionalization of experiential education is also ongoing and continuous, involving constant monitoring, needs assessment, examination of how experiential learning can be tied to the curriculum, development of courses and programs with active learning components, and establishment of systems to ensure quality.

One purpose of the subsequent three-year project was to continue to refine our understanding of the ways to integrate experiential education into the ongoing structure and curriculum of postsecondary education. Having worked with a small number of institutions in the pilot study, we wanted to test five different levels of assistance in this project that would make it possible to serve many more schools cost-effectively.

The assistance provided to the twenty schools in the pilot project was through intensive, on-campus consultations. With travel costs and consulting fees, this can be an expensive model of assistance. We realized that additional types of intervention and more trained NSIEE Consultants were necessary in order to respond to the increasing number of requests for help and to provide services less expensively. The National Project to Strengthen Experiential Education in U.S. Colleges and Universities was designed to meet these needs.

IV. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. The table on the next page shows the number of schools which NSIEE proposed to serve through this project and the number actually served:

Model	Number of Schools the Project Served: Proposed to FIPSE	Actually served
1: On-site Campus Consultations	15	35
2: Regional or Thematic Workshops	24	265+
3: National Workshop with Individual Consultation	25	6
4: National Workshop Only	56	143
5: Observer Institutions (dropped)	40	5
TOTALS	**160**	**454+**

NSIEE thus served through this project almost three times the number of colleges and universities we originally proposed to serve. See Appendix A for a complete list of the institutions participating in the National Project to Strengthen Experiential Education in U.S. Colleges and Universities.

The five different models of service delivery tested in this project are described below:

Model 1: On-site Campus Consultations. This was the most individualized type of assistance. It offered considerable face-to-face help, written recommendations, and the availability of the NSIEE Consultant for follow-up assistance by phone and mail. NSIEE staff worked with the campus-based advocates to identify the most appropriate Consultant based on the needs of the institution and the skills and expertise of the Consultant. Our cadre of Consultants represent a very diverse group of experiential educators with regard to academic backgrounds, positions, and experience in a variety of experiential education programs. A typical visit averaged 3 consulting days (2 days on site plus 1 day per visit for planning, preparation, and a report or other follow-up communications). The school paid the Consultant's fees and travel expenses.

Model 2: Regional or Thematic Workshops. Originally, we planned to have three institutions from the same area form a regional cluster and combine resources for a 2-day consultant visit on one of the campuses. We found that schools would rather pay all of the consulting costs to have a more focused consultation on their own campuses. We thus decided to try two variations on the Model 2 "cluster of schools" idea. The first was a thematic (rather than regional) cluster. Cluster consultations were held on

such topics as linking public service with the curriculum and utilizing experiential education to support the mission of a liberal arts college.

The second variation was regional workshops that involve a number of institutions rather than just three as originally proposed. We conducted both (1) free-standing regional conferences and (2) workshops piggybacked onto the programs of existing regional and national organizations. The workshops varied in size and scope. The participating institutions or the organization(s) sponsoring the workshop paid the cost of the consultant's (or consultants') fees and travel expenses. See Appendix B for copies of workshop announcements and agendas. Examples of other organizations through which NSIEE conducted workshops include the American Association for Higher Education, the Association of American Colleges, the Council of Independent Colleges, the American Political Science Association, the Cooperative Education Association, and the National Collegiate Honors Council.

Model 3: National Workshop with Individual Consultation. A team of representatives from institutions participating in Model 3 attended a national workshop held in conjunction with the NSIEE National Conference. The workshop provided a conceptual overview of the issues involved in strengthening experiential education in a college or university and help in assessing where the school is within that process. An NSIEE Consultant then met separately with the school's team to focus on the particular issues of concern. The Consultant helped to assess the school's current status and suggested strategies for institutionalization. The participating institution paid one fee which covered both the workshop and the individual consulting time with the school's representatives.

We have decided to drop Model 3 due to scheduling conflicts for the representatives from the participating institutions and the NSIEE Consultants during the NSIEE National Conference. It proved to be very difficult to arrange a satisfactory time slot for the individual consultations because of the packed agendas of these conferences.

Model 4: National Workshop Only. Representatives from the institutions participating in Model 4 attended NSIEE National Conferences and participated in a national workshop on issues that are critical in the process of strengthening experiential education. This model was the same as Model 3 except that it involved no individual consulting time or follow-up assistance. This model provided a low-cost, low-risk way to become more familiar with the institutionalization process. We found that this is a good model for an individual who is considering taking a leadership role in helping his or her institution to move toward a more comprehensive approach to experiential education. Participants paid their own travel expenses and a workshop registration fee. See Appendix C for the agendas of the national workshops held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in October, 1985; Seattle, Washington in October, 1986; and Smugglers' Notch, Vermont in October, 1987.

We will continue to offer workshops on strengthening experiential education as a major subtheme of NSIEE National Conferences. Representatives from colleges, universities, and secondary schools will participate in a variety of workshops that address the institutionalization process.

Model 5: Observer Institutions. This model was discontinued due to the evolution of Model 2. Representatives of five area institutions were invited to attend a segment of one of the regional cluster workshops in 1986. They did not receive individual assistance from the NSIEE Consultant. The only cost to the observer institutions was their representatives' travel expenses.

To meet the project's objectives through these models of service delivery, NSIEE used a variety of strategies for increasing the impact of the project, including the following:

1. Mailed packets of information about the project periodically to over 600 institutions, inviting them to participate in any of the models. Packets included a description of the project and ways to participate, a proposal form, and a list of institutions that had already participated. This list apparently provided some "peer pressure" for schools to want to be included among well-known or similar institutions.

2. Asked each school interested in Models 1 and 3 to submit an in-depth proposal. We found that the process of completing the proposal helped the applicants to assess the current campus conditions regarding experiential education and to clarify the critical issues involved in integrating it more fully into the institutional mission and goals, curriculum, faculty work load, and administrative and fiscal structures. We also asked the authorizing official for the applying unit (the whole school or a major division) to sign the proposal. Our purpose in requesting this was to enhance upper-level administrators' awareness of the status of experiential education on their campuses and the specific problems and needs that required attention. See Appendix D for a copy of the proposal form.

3. Created a formal letter of agreement with institutions participating in Models 1 and 3. The letter specified the roles and responsibilities of the participating institutions and NSIEE. This letter provided another vehicle for reminding officials of the seriousness of their participation and for encouraging their commitment.

4. Wrote letters to the president, chancellor, dean, and other high-level administrators congratulating them on their institution's selection as a participating school in this national project. We sent copies to the primary contact person at the school. The purpose of the letters was to make the administration aware of the "prestige" of taking part in a national project and to point out the visibility the school is gaining by taking leadership in experiential education. We hoped that the copies of the letter would reinforce the efforts of the experiential educator on campus who had initiated the application process.

5. Provided information, referral, and technical assistance throughout the project. The NSIEE Consultants and NSIEE staff made participants aware of the variety of resources available through NSIEE's National Resource Center on Experiential Education. We also referred them to other

individuals who had dealt with similar issues, and we recommended additional professional development opportunities offered across the country.

6. Selected and provided training for 10 new NSIEE Consultants. One of the major objectives of the project was to expand the pool of individuals who could serve as effective consultants to colleges and universities on the complex issues regarding the institutionalization of experiential education. We already had four experienced Consultants -- John Duley, Thomas Little, Jane Permaul, and Sharon Rubin -- who had participated in the 1983-1985 NSIEE/FIPSE pilot project. We trained eight individuals the first year and three the second year of the project. One Consultant Trainee decided to drop her involvement after the first year. Appendix E provides a list of the 15 NSIEE Consultants and staff who are now part of the consulting capacity created by this project.

   We used the following criteria in recruiting and selecting the Consultant Trainees: broad exposure to several types of experiential education programs, personal experience as a catalyst for institutional change, and the self-confidence and personal presence to be an effective consultant to high-level administrators at colleges and universities. Also critical were academic credibility and astute observational and analytical skills. We used an apprenticeship approach to involve each trainee for a year in the single campus consultations, regional workshops, consultations at the national conferences, the national workshops, and the follow-up reports and communications that are part of all these activities.

   We conducted three 2 1/2 day training and planning seminars for the Consultant Trainees, the Consultants, and the project staff. See Appendix F for the agendas and evaluation results of the seminars held in North Carolina and Rhode Island. These seminars allowed the Consultants and staff to reflect on the five models of service delivery, hammer out necessary changes, grapple with complex issues about the process of strengthening experiential education, discuss principles of institutional change, and share techniques that had worked so far. NSIEE staff and Consultants engaged in a strategic planning process during these seminars.

   A major outcome of the seminars was the development of yearly strategic plans for NSIEE's work in the institutionalization of experiential education. We outlined detailed strategies for on-campus consulting, regional and national workshops, enhancing the role of experiential learning in various movements for educational reform, empowering the advocates of experiential education, and assessing and disseminating the project's emerging results. The Consultants made personal commitments to undertake volunteer initiatives based on their individual interests and areas of expertise.

   Another component of the training program was enhancing the professional development of the individual Consultants. Staff recommended readings, planned with them for their own learning objectives, and discussed with them their assessment of the effectiveness of their consulting style throughout the project.

7. Conducted formative and summative evaluations. See Section V of this report for the results.

8. Wrote, edited, and disseminated four sets of publications related to issues in institutionalizing the use of active learning. Before listing them, we would like to mention a development that occurred during the course of the project and helped to shape the direction of many of our activities. In our report of the first year, we indicated a growing interest on the part of the higher education community in the connection between experiential education and the community and service goals of the institution. In conversations with NSIEE staff and Consultants, many administrators and educators articulated the desire to integrate community and public service into their programs and courses. As a result, we responded to this need for help in integrating service-learning programs into the curriculum. The following publications written by NSIEE Consultants, members, and staff also reflect this assistance.

   - Four papers presented at the 1987 NSIEE National Conference in Vermont. The titles and authors are: "Liberal Arts, Experiential Learning and Public Service: Necessary Ingredients for Socially Responsible Undergraduate Education," by Timothy Stanton, "The Liberal Tradition of Civic Education," by Edward O'Neil, "Learning by Heart: The Role of Action in Civic Education," by Steven Schultz, and "Public Service and Education: Assessing a Community Setting as a Learning Context" by Richard Couto.

   - Three NSIEE Occasional Papers. The titles and authors are: "Academic Excellence and Community Service: The Integrating Role of Undergraduate Internships," by Jon Wagner and "Experiential Teaching" and "Strengthening Experiential Education: Three Stories and the Lessons They Teach" by Sharon Rubin.

   - Service-Learning: An Annotated Bibliography for Linking Public Service with the Curriculum edited by Janet Luce of Stanford University, Chairperson of the NSIEE Special Interest Group on Public and Community Service-Learning.

   - Service-Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service. This publication is in production now. It is being written for educators, community leaders, and policymakers who want to strengthen programs for service-learning and establish policies which support the goals of service-learning.

V. PROJECT RESULTS

The primary result of the project is the progress made toward strengthening the use of and the support for experiential education at the 454 colleges and

universities served by the project. This number represents approximately one-seventh of all the postsecondary institutions in the country. See Appendix A for a list of those served. Information about the particular changes at these schools is provided later in this section.

Besides the changes at the participating institutions, there are several project results related to (1) the understanding of how institutional change occurs, (2) how an outside organization can act as an effective catalyst for educational improvement and innovation, and (3) the capacity of NSIEE to continue to facilitate the strengthening of experiential education in U.S. colleges and universities. It is beyond the scope of this report to discuss all the insights and new ground broken on the process of facilitating institutional change. Copies of the sourcebook and the annual plans on this from the NSIEE Consultants' team are available upon request.

NSIEE's experimentation with five project models provides a set of tested interventions which could be useful to any organization wanting to act as a catalyst for long-term institutional change. The following example demonstrates how two or three models of assistance were sometimes used by the same school to multiply the benefits of the project. The Associate Dean of a particular liberal arts college participated in a session we sponsored at the 1987 AAHE National Conference on Higher Education. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs then attended an NSIEE session at an annual institute of the Council of Independent Colleges. Two months later, the President talked with an NSIEE staff member at a gathering we co-sponsored at the annual conference of the Association of American Colleges. The Director of Experiential Learning, who had been using NSIEE's information and technical assistance services for several years, brought six of her faculty to a regional workshop. The College also contracted with NSIEE for a half-day of consulting time to discuss strategies for integrating experiential

learning into the curriculum. The project has thus used multiple approaches to support systemic change.

NSIEE's capacity to continue to facilitate the strengthening of experiential education has been greatly increased by the development of the pool of trained consultants and the refining of our understanding of institutional change. The papers and books supported by the project will also assist us in continuing work on this ambitious effort.

Evaluation of the project. We conducted a variety of evaluations throughout the project to assess the effectiveness of the different service delivery models. A major final evaluation was done to assess the project results and to provide an in-depth view of the process of institutional change to strengthen support for experiential education. Summaries of these evaluations follow.

Evaluation of the NSIEE Consultants. We asked academic administrators, faculty, and program directors who met with an NSIEE Consultant through Model 1 (On-site campus consultation) and Model 3 (National Workshop with individual consultation) to evaluate his or her effectiveness on a variety of levels. Appendix G gives the overall results of these evaluations. The highest scores (mean score of 4.6 out of 5 possible points) were given for "knowing what roles are appropriate for an outside consultant" and "having a personal 'presence' (personal and professional style, general bearing) that was effective on your campus and with your superiors." We attribute these findings to the excellent skills and qualifications of the Consultants, the training program, and the selection of the most appropriate Consultant for the type of institution and its particular needs. The second ranked aspect about the Consultants' effectiveness was "communicating verbally in the consultant role" (mean score of 4.5 out of 5 possible points). This response is consistent with the findings from the summative evaluation in which we asked Model 1 and 3 participants about the most

helpful features of the project. See that section below.

Evaluation of regional and thematic workshops. As reported above, Model 2 workshops changed from the way we envisioned them at the beginning of the project. Dozens of workshops on strengthening experiential education were conducted at free-standing conferences and at conferences sponsored by other organizations and associations. See Appendix B for sample agendas. It would be impossible to comment on all of the workshops. However, we would like to use as an example a symposium that NSIEE co-sponsored and helped to organize -- "Integrating Experiential Education into a Liberal Arts College," held in 1986 in Greensboro, North Carolina. NSIEE co-sponsored this with the Piedmont Independent College Association (PICA) and the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning. Four liberal arts colleges worked with us to plan the workshop, and 10 institutions participated. See Appendix H for the agenda and evaluation results. In the evaluation, we asked participants, "What were the results of the symposium for you?" The result checked most often as one of the three most significant was, "I am more aware how experiential education can support the goals of students, faculty, and the college itself." Advocacy for experiential education requires that those campus-based advocates be able to articulate the benefits of such education for the individual learner, instructor, and the institution. This understanding is a basis for grappling with the complexities of institutionalization.

Evaluation of National Workshops. NSIEE conducted three national workshops on strengthening experiential education within educational institutions. Sessions dealt with the critical issues involved in the process of integrating experiential education into the mission and values of the institution and into the curriculum, increasing faculty involvement, ensuring quality, establishing effective administrative structures, and combining community service and

learning. NSIEE Consultants also worked with participants in small groups for discussion and planning for specific action steps to be taken back on campus. Participants wrote their plans and gave a copy to NSIEE staff. We recommended resources they could use to meet their objectives and followed up with participants to provide support.

On both the 1986 and 1987 workshop evaluations, the most significant results of the workshop for the participants were identical. The highest ranked result was, "I feel more motivated to do what it takes to integrate experiential education into the institution." As we will discuss below in more detail in the section on the summative evaluation, institutionalizing experiential education is very slow and moves through stages. It is understandable that campus-based advocates would likely feel frustrated with the pace of the change process. We are very pleased that participating in these workshops has been a motivator for continued commitment to strengthening experiential education.

The second most significant result was, "I met people who can be helpful to me as my school begins or continues a process of 'institutionalizing' experiential education." One of the longstanding traditions of NSIEE is its grassroots network of people who serve as peer resources for each other on different topics related to experiential education. It is a value and a style to which the NSIEE staff and Board of Directors are consciously committed. Opportunities for people to meet and exchange information and ideas about strategies for institutionalizing experiential education are also an extremely valuable resource.

The third most significant result was, "I see my program in a broader institutional context." One of the major goals of the project was to help program directors see the "bigger picture" (i.e., to understand the relationship of their programs to the college and university priorities of teaching, research,

community service, and institutional stability and status). The evaluation documented that workshop participants were helped to see that experiential education does relate to each of these institutional priorities.

These results tell us that the goals of the national workshops were met. During the 1987 NSIEE National Conference, the NSIEE Consultants conducted personal interviews with attendees who had participated in the project. We used the interview questions to enhance awareness of the process of institutional change, to assess the project after two years, and as a pre-test for the questions to ask on the final evaluation forms.

Summative evaluation. See Appendix I for the final evaluation of the project which includes substantive comments by participants. This evaluation report is an assessment of NSIEE'S five-year effort to strengthen experiential education in colleges and universities. Questionnaires were sent to high-level administrators, faculty, and program directors who had participated in both the pilot and subsequent projects. Listed below are some of the most important findings:

1. The most progress that has been made toward the institutionalization of experiential education is through increasing the participants' understanding of how to bring about change on their campuses (4.04 out of 5 possible points). This result was a goal of the project, that is, to help the experiential education community become more sophisticated in principles of effective institutional change.

2. Model 1 participants report the most progress made in strengthening experiential education when compared to Models 2, 3, and 4. This is not surprising, since Model 1 provided the most intensive form of assistance by NSIEE Consultants.

3. More progress on some aspects of institutionalization was made by pilot schools (those that began participation in the project in 1983 or 1984) as compared to the schools that participated only in the later project (1985-1988). On three aspects of institutionalizing experiential education, the pilot schools showed more progress, thus suggesting that these are efforts that involve policy changes that require a longer period of time to accomplish. These three aspects are: (1) recognition of experiential education as a legitimate part of the curriculum; (2) faculty involvement in experiential education; and (3) recognition of experiential education activities during tenure and promotion decisions.

4. The three features of the project rated most helpful for strengthening experiential education by participants in Model 1 relate to meetings with the NSIEE Consultant. Most helpful were individual meetings (81% said these "Helped a lot"). Group meetings were the second most helpful (63% found these "Helped a lot"). The third most helpful feature was the Consultant's meetings with high officials on campus (56% found these "Helped a lot"). It appears that personal contact and the opportunity to have in-depth discussions with an NSIEE Consultant are extremely valuable for campus-based advocates who want to develop strategies for strengthening experiential education and perhaps receive professional support.

5. The greatest barriers to institutional change regarding experiential education reported by participants were lack of faculty acceptance and support of experiential education. A lack of commitment to experiential education by high-level administrators was also identified as an obstacle by faculty and program directors.

6. At the schools served by the project, significantly more students are participating in experiential learning programs today than five years ago when the project began. An average of 370 students currently participate per year on each campus, while only 182 students participated five years ago. Thus, the number of students participating in experiential education per year has increased 104% in five years at the schools served by the project. One of the objectives of the project was to increase the number of students participating in experiential education.

7. According to participants, the most important steps needed now to strengthen experiential education are greater faculty involvement and a commitment of resources by the institution for faculty compensation and program development. As we learned in our pilot efforts, in order for institutions to utilize the full value of learning through experience, they must integrate experiential education into their institutional missions, curricula, faculty roles, and financial and administrative structures.

8. Overall, the kinds of assistance most needed now by the participants in the project are workshops for faculty on experiential education (60% of the participants report a need for this) and workshops on strengthening experiential education (37% of the participants checked this). The need for faculty training and for greater understanding of the strategies involved in institutionalizing experiential education are consistent with other findings. It appears that participants think that workshops are the most appropriate vehicle for them at the current time.

In summary, the project has had a positive impact on strengthening experiential education on college and university campuses. Each of the four models of service delivery has helped participating colleges and universities. All of the project features evaluated were found to be helpful to participants in their efforts to strengthen experiential education. There has been a major

increase in the number of students who are participating in experiential education programs in the last five years. Finally, program directors have become more knowledgeable about the ongoing nature of the process of strengthening experiential education, and more empowered to take leadership to integrate experiential education across their institutions.

We also see that there remains a great deal of work to do with faculty and campus officials. More faculty need to see experiential education as a pedagogy and be encouraged to incorporate it into their teaching styles. This requires continued advocacy and training. Faculty recognition and compensation for their involvement in experiential education are critical if their participation is to be sustained. Upper-level administrators need to acknowledge the issue of faculty compensation and commit the necessary resources to ensure that faculty are properly rewarded. Those who understand the multiple ways that experiential education can contribute to their institution's mission are beginning to do this, but it is a slow process.

Publicity and dissemination. We have conducted a wide range of publicity and dissemination activities. National and regional conference presentations and workshops have provided numerous opportunities to discuss the project and share with thousands of people what we are learning about strengthening experiential education. Several project participants have written articles about the progress they have made toward institutionalization which have been published in Experiential Education, the bi-monthly newsletter of NSIEE. An article about strengthening experiential education was also written for the Journal of Cooperative Education. Approximately 1,500 copies of the sourcebook, Strengthening Experiential Education Within Your Institution, have been distributed. This book outlines case studies and advice from the twenty colleges and universities involved in the 1983-85 pilot project. Information about the

sourcebook and the project was mailed to the members of NSIEE, the American Association for Higher Education, the Association of American Colleges, the American Political Science Association, the American College Personnel Association, and several other educational associations. Announcements of the project activities and publications have been published in the newsletters of 28 national and regional associations. Seventy-seven national and regional organizations are serving as Cooperating Organizations with NSIEE on the forthcoming book Service-Learning: A Resource Book for Public and Community Service.

We will disseminate the findings of the final evaluation to the NSIEE Consultants for their use in future consultations and trainings on the process of institutionalizing experiential education, to NSIEE members, and to higher education policymakers, academic administrators, faculty, and directors of experiential education programs who are interested in institutionalizing experiential education. One vehicle for continued dissemination of the project results is NSIEE's National Resource Center on Experiential Education, which offers information on over 225 topics in the field. We will continue to look for ways to share what we have learned through this longitudinal evaluation via presentations and workshops at national and regional conferences, articles in Experiential Education, and articles in the journals and newsletters of other educational associations.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Through this project, the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education served one-seventh of all colleges and universities in the U.S. by (1) working with over 100 national and regional associations, (2) developing a cadre of 13 trained, committed consultants who served as a talent pool for all

aspects of the project, and (3) experimenting with five flexible models of service delivery.

We have found three models for service delivery to be effective in helping schools institutionalize experiential education on their campuses, and feasible for NSIEE to continue. These are: Model 1: On-site campus consultations, Model 2: Regional or thematic workshops, and Model 4: National Workshops. These different levels of assistance required varying levels of investment of time and financial resources by the participating institutions. Because schools are at different stages with regard to experiential education and to their institutionalization goals, and because they make changes according to their unique cultures, it was very important to have project models that were flexible and responsive to their particular needs at the time they requested assistance.

The selection and training of NSIEE Consultants was critical in ensuring the credibility of the project and the capacity of NSIEE to serve one-seventh of the postsecondary institutions in the U.S. Both NSIEE staff and Consultants invested a great deal of time in the design of the three annual seminars for consultant training and planning. The level of commitment and creativity stimulated by this group of 15 leaders were well worth the investment. This project demonstrated the incredible power of a small group of committed individuals with diverse talents.

The variety of the types of requests for assistance from schools has been noteworthy. Due to the diverse backgrounds and expertise of the NSIEE Consultants, we were able to respond to the variety of needs expressed. Schools did not always express their requests as needing help with "strengthening experiential education." Examples included requests for evaluations of internship and cooperative education programs, advice on designing a service-learning program, assistance with a long-range plan for a division of a

university, and training for departments of educational administration on the use of experiential learning in their curricula, to name just a few.

Some results of the project that have been described throughout this report and the final evaluation bear repeating. They are:

1. The importance of communication among top officials, faculty, and directors of experiential learning programs should be underscored. Documentation about the value of experiential education for the institutional goals of teaching, research, service, and institutional status and stability should be included in campus discussions and reports.

2. Faculty involvement in experiential education is crucial for its integration into the mainstream of higher education. Faculty must use experiential education effectively as a teaching and learning tool with their students if it is to be taken seriously by academic administrators and skeptical colleagues. A corollary is that faculty must be recognized for their participation. Experiential education activities need to be built into faculty reward systems.

3. Institutional change is a slow process requiring focused attention and an enduring commitment by advocates to the issues that are critical for strengthening experiential education. These individuals need to be made aware of the nature of the change process in order to encourage them to persist in their efforts. Training for leadership for institutional change is an area that NSIEE staff and Consultants plan to pursue in greater depth, building upon the rich foundation we have been able to build through our work on the pilot and subsequent projects.

FINAL EVALUATION

National Project to Strengthen Experiential Education in U.S. Colleges and Universities

National Society for Internships and Experiential Education

The following is a summative evaluation of the National Project to Strengthen Experiential Education in U.S. Colleges and Universities. This project was conducted from 1985-1988 by the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (NSIEE) with partial support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education. A pilot project, also supported by FIPSE, was conducted from 1983-1985. This evaluation includes a longitudinal study of the changes at the 20 pilot institutions over the past four to five years.

The purposes of the evaluation are to: (1) assess the impact of the project; (2) identify the factors that contribute to institutional change as it relates to experiential education; (3) determine factors that act as barriers to strengthening experiential education; (4) learn what progress has been made toward institutionalizing experiential education; (5) evaluate the effects of NSIEE's interventions, timing, requirements, and resources; (6) learn what participants see as the next steps for strengthening experiential education; (7) raise participants' awareness of the ongoing nature of the process of strengthening experiential education; (8) foster participants' awareness of the value of research for documenting the contributions of experiential education programs to institutional missions and goals; and (9) identify current issues and further assistance needed.

Three hundred forty-seven questionnaires were sent to high-level administrators, faculty, and program directors whose schools participated in the five-year project. A total of 76 questionnaires were returned from the one mailing done. Four models of service delivery were assessed. Samples of the questionnaires are attached.

We were interested in learning about the project's impact depending upon three variables: by the type of model (i.e., Model 1, 2, 3, or 4), by the type of school (i.e., pilot school in 1983-1985 or non-pilot in 1985-1988), and by the type of position in the institution held by the respondent (i.e., high-level administrator, faculty, or program director). Following are the numbers of respondents for each variable:

Models:		# responding
Model 1:	On-site campus consultation	36
Model 2:	Regional or thematic workshops	17
Model 3:	National Workshop with individual consultation	3
Model 4:	NSIEE National Workshop only	20

Schools:	Number
Pilot	20
Non-pilot	56

Positions:	Number
High-level administrator	13
Faculty	9
Program director	54

About the schools: 47% Public; 53% Private
17% Rural; 39% Urban; 45% Suburban

The sizes of the institutions by total FTE enrollment range from 400-25,000; the average is 4,609 students. For the majority of schools (71%) the whole institution participated in the project.

I. PROGRESS TOWARD INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION

The first series of questions deals with progress that has been made with various aspects of institutionalizing experiential education. Participants were asked to indicate what has happened with each of the critical issues over the last 1-5 years. Following is the summary of responses.

Aspects of institutionalization progress	Mean score where: 5 = increased greatly and 1 = decreased greatly	N
1. Recognition of experiential education as contributing to the mission and goals of your institution	3.96	76
2. Recognition of experiential education as a legitimate part of the curriculum	3.63	76
3. Recognition of experiential education as a legitimate part of degree requirements	3.45	74
4. Establishment of policies or procedures that help to ensure quality in experiential education	3.77	75
5. Faculty involvement in experiential education	3.62	76
6. Recognition of experiential education as part of faculty members' regular work loads	3.27	75
7. Recognition of experiential education activities in system of faculty compensation	3.11	73

Aspects of institutionalization progress	Mean score where: 5 = increased greatly and 1 = decreased greatly	N
8. Recognition of experiential education activities during tenure and promotion	3.07	71
9. Budgetary support for experiential education	3.59	74
10. Development of an administrative or organizational structure that is appropriate for and supportive of experiential education	3.62	76
11. Your own understanding of how to bring about change in your institution or division	4.04	76
12. Your institution's capacity to respond to needs in your community or the larger social arena	3.69	75

The most progress was made on increasing the respondent's understanding of how to bring about change (4.04 out of 5 possible points). This result was one of the goals of the project, that is, to help campus-based advocates of improvement in the teaching/learning process to become more sophisticated in using principles of effective institutional change. Participants have thus become more empowered to take the needed steps for institutionalizing experiential education within their schools.

Recognition of experiential education as contributing to the mission and goals of the institution also received a high score (3.96 out of 5 possible points). This finding suggests that progress was made in seeing the relationship between experiential education and the cultural values and missions of colleges and universities and gaining recognition of this relationship across the institution.

The two aspects of institutional change which received the lowest scores are recognition of experiential education activities during tenure and promotion decisions (3.07 out of 5 possible points) and recognition of experiential education activities in the system of faculty compensation (3.11). This is not surprising, since these issues both involve major policy changes for most schools. They require focused attention and long-term commitment.

We compared the answers of respondents who participated in the four models of institutionalization assistance provided by the project to see if schools made more progress through a particular model.

The mean scores on a 5-point scale across all twelve aspects of institutionalization progress for three of the four models are listed below. Model 3, National Workshop with individual consultation is omitted from all analyses by model because only three responses were received from this group.

Model	Mean (5-point scale)	N
Model 1: On-site campus consultation	3.74	36
Model 2: Regional or thematic workshops	3.51	17
Model 4: National Workshop only	3.45	20

Model 1 had the highest score, thereby showing that overall, Model 1 schools have made more progress when compared to schools in Model 2, 3, and 4. Model 1 schools also show a greater increase on each aspect of strengthening experiential education within the institution.

Below is a chart listing the mean scores for each of the twelve aspects of institutional change for each model. Model 3 is not listed because there were only three respondents who participated in this model.

Aspects of institutionalization progress	Mean (on 5 point scale where 5 = increased greatly and 1 = decreased greatly)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 4
1. Recognition of experiential education as contributing to the mission and goals of your institution	4.03	4.0	3.95
2. Recognition of experiential education as a legitimate part of the curriculum	3.81	3.64	3.45
3. Recognition of experiential education as a legitimate part of degree requirements	3.64	3.37	3.16
4. Establishment of policies or procedures that help to ensure quality in experiential education	4.0	3.82	3.55
5. Faculty involvement in experiential education	3.89	3.59	3.35
6. Recognition of experiential education as part of faculty members' regular work loads	3.40	3.23	3.20
7. Recognition of experiential education activities in system of faculty compensation	3.23	3.13	3.0
8. Recognition of experiential education activities during tenure and promotion decisions	3.29	2.87	2.95
9. Budgetary support for experiential education	3.75	3.47	3.55

Aspects of institutionalization progress (cont.)	Mean (on 5 point scale where 5 = increased greatly and 1 = decreased greatly)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 4
10. Development of an administrative or organizational structure that is appropriate for and supportive of experiential education	3.72	3.41	3.65
11. Your own understanding of how to bring about change in your institution or division	4.14	3.94	3.95
12. Your institution's capacity to respond to needs in your community or the larger social arena	3.89	3.59	3.60

Comparing schools that participated in the pilot project (1983-1985) with those that participated within the last three years, we find some interesting results. More progress is reported by pilot institutions for the following aspects:

Aspects of institutionalization progress	Mean (on 5 point scale where 5 = increased greatly and 1 = decreased greatly)	
	Pilot schools	Non-pilot schools
Recognition of experiential education as part of the curriculum	3.9	3.46
Faculty involvement in experiential education	4.05	3.46
Recognition of experiential education activities during tenure and promotion decisions	3.33	2.98

These findings suggest that all three of these changes entail a slow process of policy development and institutional recognition.

Do the results tell us that there are differences in the perceptions of high-level administrators, faculty, and program directors about the progress that has been made at their institutions? Yes, for some aspects of institutional change. More program directors reported that policies or procedures have been established to ensure quality in experiential education (mean score of 3.83 out of 5 possible points in comparison to 3.69 for high-level administrators and 3.55 for faculty.

Faculty see less movement on two factors than do high-level administrators and directors:

1. Recognition of experiential education as part of faculty members' regular work loads (mean score of 3.0 out of a possible 5 points). For high-level administrators, the mean score was 3.23, and for directors, 3.32.

2. Recognition of experiential education activities during tenure and promotion decisions (mean score of 2.89 out of a possible 5 points). For high-level administrators, the mean score was 3.23, and for directors, 3.06.

The data show that the project helped directors understand better how to bring about institutional change (mean score of 4.13 out of 5 possible points). This is slightly higher than for high-level administrators (mean score of 4.0). The mean score for faculty was 3.56.

II. CLARIFICATION OF ISSUES

When asked if participating in the project helped to clarify the issues they face in strengthening experiential education, the majority (68%) of participants said "Yes." When we look at how participants in different models responded, we find that the project was more helpful for Model 1: On-site campus consultation and Model 4: National Workshop only (90% and 84% responded yes, respectively). This is not surprising because in both models participants are exposed to and examine the full range of issues that affect the institutionalization of experiential education. Model 2: Regional or thematic workshops usually focus on only one or two particular topics.

Those who answered "Yes" to the question above were asked in what ways the project helped clarify the issues they face in strengthening experiential education. The full responses to this and the other open-ended evaluation questions are attached. Help in recognizing the need for faculty development and administrative support were the responses most often given. Help in understanding the need for quality of standards for learning and evaluation was also mentioned frequently. Other areas the project shed light on for participants were awareness of alternatives for planning, monitoring, and evaluating internships; greater understanding of the process of institutional change; and more acknowledgment of the barriers to be faced.

III. CATALYSTS FOR CHANGE

Participants were asked, "What events or initiatives at your school have made the biggest difference in strengthening experiential education within your institution? Describe how they happened." See the responses attached. Their comments in order of frequency of response included: increased faculty involvement, greater recognition for faculty who sponsor students as interns, progress toward faculty compensation, creation of a new administrative structure for coordinating internship programs, consultations by NSIEE, and increased support from upper-level administrators. The focus on faculty concerns clearly stands out.

Participants in only Model 1: On-site campus consultation and Model 3: National Workshop with individual consultation were asked to rate the effect of the various project features on strengthening experiential education within their institutions. The results are summarized below. The number of responses for each question varies because not all questions are relevant to both models and all

campus positions.

Feature of the project	Helped a lot	Helped some	Didn't make any difference	Hurt our efforts
A. Individual meetings you had with your NSIEE Consultant (N = 16)	81%	13%	6%	
B. Group meetings held with your NSIEE Consultant on campus (N = 16)	63%	38%		
C. Meeting with high officials on your campus while your NSIEE Consultant was there (N = 9)	56%	33%	11%	
D. Report(s) and recommendations you received from your NSIEE Consultant (N = 19)	47%	32%	21%	
E. Other resource materials or information provided to you or others on your campus by your NSIEE Consultant (N = 17)	47%	47%	6%	
F. Circulation of your NSIEE Consultant's report to selected persons on your campus (N = 11)	45%	36%	18%	
G. Selection of your institution as a participating school in this project (N = 20)	45%	30%	25%	
H. Knowing that FIPSE, NSIEE, and other institutions are interested in your work on these issues (N = 19)	32%	26%	42%	
I. Asking you to write a proposal outlining your program, your needs, your institutionalization goals, and how an NSIEE Consultant would be used (N = 20)	25%	55%	20%	
J. Asking the authorizing official for your campus or unit to review the proposal and sign it before submission to NSIEE (N = 11)	18%	36%	45%	
K. Asking your authorizing official to sign the letter of agreement about your school's participation in the project (N = 12)	17%	42%	42%	

We can conclude from the data that all project features helped some respondents to strengthen experiential education; no project features hurt. This suggests that we should continue all the features listed for Models 1 and 3.

The meetings the NSIEE Consultant had with participants appear to be the most helpful feature of Models 1 and 3. Most helpful were individual meetings (81% found these "Helped a lot"). The second most helpful feature was group meetings (63% found these "Helped a lot"). In third place were meetings held with high officials on campus (56% found these "Helped a lot"). A hypothesis about why these features ranked so highly is that the participants have a need to meet face-to face with an outside consultant to discuss their strategies for strengthening experiential education at their schools. It appears that there is something very powerful about these opportunities for dialogue, interaction, and professional support.

For project features which participants indicated "helped a lot," they were asked to explain why these features were particularly helpful. The responses are attached.

Participants were asked to comment about what NSIEE or the NSIEE Consultant did that made the biggest difference. The most common responses in order of frequency were: legitimized experiential education to faculty, provided the opportunity for faculty to examine and discuss what needed to be done to improve experiential learning offerings for students, clarified ambiguous issues and concerns, wrote helpful reports and recommendations, reinforced that the school was on the right track in its efforts to strengthen its experiential education programs, and provided a broader context for schools to understand critical issues of institutionalization.

One participant wrote, "[The Consultant] helped us as an institution to see where we were going and to understand our initial needs. This came out in his report. Helped me in an accurate and perceptive way see the stance of faculty on experiential education in general, and on volunteerism, internships, and community service."

Sixty-nine per cent of the participants reported that the Consultants' recommendations were implemented. Those who answered affirmatively described particular recommendations that made a difference in strengthening experiential education. Comments included: departments are now offering internships for non-majors which is providing students the opportunity for interdisciplinary studies, the administration of the program has been restructured, a faculty advisory committee has been established, program policies are being clarified, priorities of the program have been identified, and experiential learning options have been given prominence. Those who stated that the Consultant's recommendations had not been implemented most often responded that there was no funding and that it wasn't time yet. It is important to note that the reasons given are timing and money, not the appropriateness of the recommendations themselves. The full responses to this question are attached.

IV. BARRIERS TO CHANGE AND STRATEGIES FOR OVERCOMING THEM

We asked participants what factors slowed their progress, and secondly, what they have done to overcome the barriers they have encountered. All three groups

reported that a lack of faculty acceptance and support of experiential education has slowed their progress. Faculty and directors commented on limited time and energy to invest, and also the lack of top-level commitment.

Regarding the ways the participants have tried to overcome these barriers, all three groups report working with faculty (educating those who do not understand the value of experiential education, and making personal contacts). Directors in particular wrote about developing personal relationships with faculty. According to one, "[I] sought out faculty leaders and increased [the use of] personal meetings rather than phone calls and memos." Directors also mentioned writing proposals for funding. Several faculty and directors commented on their advocacy with high-level administrators. See Section VI. for more discussion of participants' initiatives.

V. INSTITUTIONAL INVESTMENTS IN CHANGE

In addition to personal initiatives for strengthening experiential education, an investment of institutional resources is needed. We asked participants to list the variety of ways their schools have invested in this process. See the responses attached. Mentioned most often were funds for attendance at NSIEE national conferences, regional conferences, consultations, membership in professional associations, computer software, publications, salary of program directors, hiring of new staff, and clerical support.

VI. WHAT HAS ACTUALLY HAPPENED?

What has actually happened at the schools that participated? What has been the impact of these developments on strengthening experiential education? Comments on the questionnaires from high-level administrators, faculty, and directors reflect the considerable advances that have occurred. See the attachments for the full responses. The changes mentioned most often are: greater acceptance and enthusiasm for experiential education, curricular innovation, establishment and clarification of policies and guidelines, more faculty involved, and an increase in the number of internship offerings.

What have participants done personally to strengthen experiential education as a result of having had an NSIEE Consultant come to their campuses or having attended a regional or thematic workshop or an NSIEE National Workshop? High-level administrators most often indicated they have implemented the Consultant's recommendations, acknowledged the accomplishments made by departments in improving the quality of their programs, and have only encouraged student participation in experiential learning opportunities that offer meaningful experiences. Faculty have made curricular changes, systematized evaluation and administrative procedures, established advisory committees, and conducted workshops and seminars for their colleagues. Program directors have increased their communication and personal contacts with faculty and administrators and created greater visibility for their programs on their campuses and in their communities.

The increase in internships noted above is consistent with findings from questions we asked regarding the increase/decrease in the number of experiential education opportunities available to students. When asked what percentage of the school's students have the opportunity to participate in some sort of school-

sponsored experiential learning program during their undergraduate years, the respondents reported very encouraging results -- an average of 79% of students have such programs available to them. However, respondents report that only 32% of the students actually do participate. This discrepancy raises the question, "Why?" How might we account for this finding? Possible reasons could include lack of program publicity; built-in disincentives, such as requiring a minimum grade point average or requiring that the student be a major in the department which offers the opportunities; or lack of faculty encouragement and support.

Despite the suggestion that less than half the students who have the opportunity to participate do actually enroll in experiential learning programs, there has been a tremendous increase in the average number of students participating per year over the last five years. An average of 370 students currently participate per year on each campus, while only 182 students participated five years ago. Thus, the number of students participating in experiential education per year has increased by 104% in five years! One of the intended outcomes of the project was for individual learners to participate in experiential education. Our data show that significantly more students are involved in experiential learning programs on the participating campuses today than five years ago when the project began.

VII. DOCUMENTING EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTITUTION

Documentation of the contributions experiential education makes to the mission and goals of the institution is an important strategy for gaining the support of administrators, faculty, students, and community sponsors. We asked participants to tell us what kinds of research or statistics they use to document these contributions, and to whom they send the results.

The most common types of research reported are: program evaluations, evaluations by the field sponsors and students, follow-up surveys to graduates, and cumulative information gathered on the number of students participating and the organizations involved. Results are sent to presidents, vice-presidents, provosts, deans, and department chairpersons. Some participants stated that research is not being done due to lack of time and computer capability. Several expressed the need for more research.

VIII. WHAT HAVE PARTICIPANTS LEARNED?

We noted earlier that of all the aspects of progress in institutionalizing experiential education, the greatest advance was an increase in participants' understanding of how to bring about change within their institutions or divisions. Later in the questionnaire we asked respondents what they had learned about the process of strengthening experiential education or initiating change. Their answers are attached. Many commented that the process is slow, difficult, and time-
consuming, and that it therefore requires patience and perseverance. Repeatedly there have been statements from all three groups about how crucial it is to have faculty involvement and support. As one participant explained,

> "It's damn difficult! Many faculty are just not aware of life beyond the classroom -- it is difficult to help them recognize the value of field

experience. But once faculty become actively involved in experiential education they are superior at bringing other faculty into the program."

Another common learning outcome was seeing the importance of communication across departments and with administrators. Related to this is keeping everyone on campus, including "president, deans, administrators informed about your activities, placements, and student accomplishments. Let the campus and faculty feel it is their program. Involve campus and community people as much as possible."

Have participants' perceptions of the issues changed since the beginning of their involvement in the project? Once again, the most common response was seeing more clearly the importance of faculty involvement in experiential education.

Advice from counterpart at other institutions who have grappled with the issues involved in strengthening experiential education can be an invaluable resource to those who want to bring about change on their own campuses. We asked participants to tell us what advice they would give to someone at a similar institution. Most said to remember to get faculty support and to tap into the resources of NSIEE. Others replied that being patient and building commitment slowly was important, as well as establishing credibility and setting realistic goals. Participants recommended attending professional workshops, reading about the field, and writing reports and articles.

When asked what participants learned about their own leadership styles, they commented most often on the need to be more assertive in their beliefs and ideas about experiential education. They also identified being able to listen, collaborate, compromise, and be flexible as important qualities to have.

See the attachments for the complete responses to these questions.

IX. WHAT IS NEEDED NOW?

What do participants think are the most important steps needed now to strengthen experiential education on their campuses? Not surprisingly, most stated the need for greater faculty interest and participation, getting more students involved, and stronger institutional commitment of resources for faculty compensation and program development. The full responses are attached.

What would need to happen in order for these steps to occur? Recognition of experiential education as part of faculty work loads, greater visibility through publicity about the benefits of experiential education for students, and funding were the answers most commonly given. Several stated that certain steps are already in process. See the attachments for the full responses.

We asked participants what kinds of assistance they anticipate they will need in the next year. The following chart summarizes the 74 responses.

Type of assistance	% of respondents needing this type of assistance
Workshops for faculty on experiential education	60%

Type of assistance	% of respondents needing this type of assistance
Workshops on strengthening experiential education in your institution	37%
Help from a consultant who visits your campus	32%
Information, referral, or technical assistance	28%
Outside evaluation of your program	24%
Publications	20%

Other types of assistance listed include:

* a chance to let our faculty share their ideas and experiences with faculty at other schools which are just getting started. People can learn from us.
* lobbying legislatures to help in loan forgiveness for volunteer work and/or tuition rebates
* increased financial support from the college
* help with proposals to grant agencies
* support from a faculty committee
* help that focuses on the special needs and problems of a small, very rural institution with more than 50% non-traditional students
* outside, private sector funding and information
* a structure that would allow me to visit model programs to see how they do what they do
* money

In looking at the assistance needed by the type of project model in which the respondent participated, we found that 50% of the participants in Model 4: National Workshop only would like to have an on-campus consultation. This is a higher percentage than for participants in the other models. One way to account for this is that Model 4 participants had the opportunity to see the NSIEE Consultants at work at the National Workshop and see why and how they could be effective on their campuses.

Participants in Model 2: Regional or thematic workshops represented the highest percentage requesting information, referral, or technical assistance. It could be that attending a regional or thematic workshop on one or two specific

topics whetted their appetite for additional resources.

With the exception of information, referral, or technical assistance and workshops for faculty, Model 4 schools responded more frequently to needing help on all levels. One explanation could be that at the National Workshop we emphasized the resources available through NSIEE. Their awareness of the types of assistance we provide was raised.

Did requests for assistance vary by position? More faculty and program directors want help from a consultant than do high-level administrators (37% of directors, 33% of faculty, and 15% of high-level administrators). When asked about the need for workshops for strengthening experiential education and workshops for faculty, responses from faculty were the highest. Responses from program directors and high-level administrators followed, respectively.

	% wanting this type of assistance		
Type of assistance	High-level administrator	Faculty	Program Director
Help from a consultant who visits your campus	15%	33%	37%
Workshop on strengthening experiential education in your institution	31%	44%	37%
Workshops for faculty on experiential education	39%	67%	64%

These findings for faculty are encouraging, since one of the critical issues institutions face in strengthening experiential education is increasing faculty involvement.

X. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Participants were asked to write any other comments they would like to add. The pure volume of responses to all the open-ended evaluation questions (attached) suggests a great deal of interest in the project and in issues related to strengthening experiential education within postsecondary institutions.

XI. SUMMARY

The project has been successful in helping schools strengthen experiential education on their campuses. The data show that: (1) progress has been made toward institutionalization by each of the four models of service delivery; (2) all of the project features evaluated were found to be helpful to participants in their efforts to strengthen experiential education; (3) significantly more numbers of students are involved in experiential education programs at the participating institutions at the present time than in 1983 when the project began; and (4) program directors have a greater understanding about how to initiate change in

their institutions, and have empowered themselves to take steps toward strengthening experiential education.

The evaluation has also helped to identify the factors that act as barriers to strengthening experiential education. The two most frequently reported by the participants are the lack of faculty endorsement of and involvement in experiential education and the lack of commitment by top officials to provide sufficient resources for faculty compensation and program development. The findings show that more faculty need to understand the value of experiential education and actively incorporate it into their teaching styles. Along with this, faculty need to be recognized and rewarded for their experiential education activities.

Two vital areas of assistance reported by the participants are: (1) training for faculty in designing experiential education courses and programs that follow principles of good practice, such as preparing students for the experience, and monitoring and evaluating the learning; and (2) training about the process of institutional change as it relates to experiential education.

There are strong messages from participants in this project about improving the quality of teaching and learning on their campuses. If college and university officials want to utilize the full value of learning through experience, there must be an institutional commitment to integrate experiential education into institutional missions and values, faculty roles and reward systems, curricula, administrative and financial structures, and systems for quality assurance.

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

National Program to Strengthen Experiential Education in U.S. Colleges & Univesities

A service of the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education

Abilene Christian University, Texas
Adrian College, Michigan
Alabama A & M University
Albion College, Michigan
Alfred State College, New York
Allegheny College, Pennsylvania
Alverno College, Wisconsin
American University, DC
Anna Maria College, Massachusetts
Antioch University Seattle, Washington
Aquinas College, Michigan
Arizona State University
Atlantic Christian College, North Carolina
Auburn University, Alabama
Augsburg College, Minnesota
Augusta College, Georgia
Aurora College, Illinois
Avila College, Kansas
Azusa Pacific University, California

Babson College, Massachusetts
Baker University, Kansas
Ball State University, Indiana
Barnard College, New York
Belmont Abbey College, North Carolina
Benedictine College, Kansas
Bennett College, North Carolina
Bentley College, Massachusetts
Berklee College of Music, Massachusetts
Bethany College, Kansas
Bethany College, West Virginia
Birmingham Southern College, Alabama
Blackfeet Community College, Montana
Bloomsburg University, Pennsylvania
Blue Ridge Community College, North Carolina
Bluefield College, Virginia
Boston College, Massachusetts
Boston University, Massachusetts
Bowling Green State University, Ohio
Bradford College, Massachusetts
Brandeis University, Massachusetts
Bridgewater State College, Massachusetts
Brigham Young University, Utah
Brookdale Community College, New York
Brown University, Rhode Island
Bucknell University, Pennsylvania
Bunker Hill Community College, Massachusetts
Butler University, Indiana

Cabrini College, Pennsylvania
California College of Arts and Crafts
California Institute for the Arts
California Lutheran University
California State University-Chico
California State University-Northridge
Calvin College, Michigan
Carlow College, Pennsylvania
Carnegie-Mellon University, Pennsylvania
Cecil Community College, Maryland
Centenary College, New Jersey
Central College, Iowa
Central Connecticut State University
Central Michigan University
Central Missouri State University, Kansas
Central Piedmont Community College, North Carolina
Central Washington University
Centralia College, Washington
Chatham College, Pennsylvania
Christopher Newport College, Virginia
City College of New York
City University, Washington
Claremont McKenna College, California
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Clark College, Washington
Clark Technical College, Ohio
Clark University, Massachusetts
Cleveland Connection, Ohio
Cleveland Institute of Art, Ohio
Cloud County Community College, Kansas
Coker College, South Carolina
Colby-Sawyer College, New Hampshire
Colgate University, New York
College of the Albemarle, North Carolina
College of Human Services, New York
College of St. Benedict, Minnesota
College of St. Catherine, Minnesota
College of St. Thomas, Minnesota
College of William & Mary, Virginia
College of Wooster, Ohio
Colorado College
Concordia College, Illinois

Converse College, South Carolina
Cornell University, New York
Corning Community College, New York
County College of Morris, New Jersey
Craven Community College, North Carolina

Daeman College, New York
Dartmouth College, New Hampshire
Davidson College, North Carolina
Delaware State College
Delaware Techical College
Delta College, Michigan
Denison University, Ohio
De Pauw University, Indiana
Dillard University, Louisiana
Doane College, Nebraska
Donnelly College, Kansas
Drake University, Iowa
Duke University, North Carolina
Duquesne University, Pennsylvania
Dynamy, Massachusetts

Earlham College, Indiana
East Carolina University, North Carolina
East Tennessee State University
Eastern Connecticut State University
Eastern Illinois University
Eastern Michigan University
Eastern Washington University
Elizabethtown College, Pennsylvania
Elmhurst College, Illinois
Elon College, North Carolina
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Florida
Emerson College, Massachusetts
Emmanuel College, Massachusetts
Empire State College, New York
Endicott College, Massachusetts
Erie County Community College, New York
Evergreen State College, Washington

Farleigh Dickinson University, New Jersey
Fashion Institute of Tech/SUNY, New York
Fayetteville State University, North Carolina
Fitchburg State College, Massachusetts
Fordham University, New York
Fort Scott Community College, Kansas
Franklin Pierce College, New Hampshire
Front Range Community College, Colorado
Frostburg State University, Maryland

Gallaudet College, DC
Gannon University, Pennsylvania
Gaston College, North Carolina
George Washington University, DC
Georgetown University, DC
Georgia College
Georgia State University
Georgian Court College, New Jersey
Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania
Glassboro State College, New Jersey
Gordon College, Massachusetts
Goucher College, Maryland
Green River Community College, Washington
Greensboro College, North Carolina
Grinnell College, Iowa
Guilford College, North Carolina

Hampton University, Virginia
Hartwick College, New York
Harvard Graduate School of Education, Massachusetts
Harvard University, Massachusetts
Haskell Indian Junior College, Kansas
High Point College, North Carolina
Highline Community College, Washington
Hobart and William Smith Colleges, New York
Holy Cross College, Massachusetts
Holyoke Community College, Massachusetts
Howard Community College, Maryland
Humboldt State University, California

Illinois Benedictine College
Illinois State University
Indiana State University
Indiana University, Indiana
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Iona College, New York
Iowa Wesleyan College

James Madison University, Virginia
Jersey City State College, New Jersey
John Brown University, Arkansas
John Carroll University, Ohio
Johns Hopkins University, Maryland
Johnson County Community College, Kansas
Johnson C. Smith University, North Carolina
Joliet Junior College, Illinois
Jordan College, Michigan
Judson College, Illinois

Kansas City Arts Institute, Kansas
Kansas City Kansas Community College,

Kansas
Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, Kansas
Kansas State University
Kean College, New Jersey
Keene State College, New Hampshire
Kennesaw College, Georgia
Keystone Junior College, Pennsylvania
King College, Tennessee
Kings College, Pennsylvania

Lafayette College, Pennsylvania
Lane Community College, Oregon
Lansing Community College, Michigan
Laramie County Community College, Wyoming
Laselle Junior College, Massachusetts
Lebanon Valley College, Pennsylvania
Lenoir-Rhyne College, North Carolina
Lincoln University, Pennsylvania
Loma Linda University, California
Long Island University, New York
Longview Community College, Kansas
Los Angeles Pierce College, California
Louisiana State University
Lynchburg College, Virginia

Macalester College, Minnesota
Manhattan College, New York
Maple Woods Community College, Kansas
Maricopa County Community College, Arizona
Marist College, New York
Marymount Manhattan College, New York
Mary Washington College, Virginia
Maryland Institute
Marywood College, Pennsylvania
Mercy College, New York
Meredith College, North Carolina
Mesa Community College, Arizona
Messiah College, Pennsylvania
Metropolitan State College, Colorado
Metropolitan State College, Minnesota
Miami University, Ohio
Michigan State University
Mid America Nazarene College, Kansas
Middlebury College, Vermont
Miles Community College, Montana
Milwaukee Area Technical College, Wisconsin
Moorhead State University, Minnesota
Moravian College, Pennsylvania
Mount Olive College, North Carolina
Mount St. Mary's College, California
Mount Vernon College, DC
Murray State University, Kentucky
Muskegon Community College, Michigan

Nazareth College of Rochester, New York
Neumann College, Pennsylvania
New College of the University of South Florida
New Jersey Institute of Technology
New York University
Niagara University, New York
North Arkansas Community College
North Carolina Central University
North Carolina State University
North Carolina Wesleyan College
North Central College, Illinois
Northern Arizona University
Northern Illinois University
Northeastern Illinois University
Northeastern University, Massachusetts
Northwest Missouri State University
North Seattle Community College, Washington
North Shore Community College, Massachusetts
Norwich University, Vermont
Notre Dame College, Ohio

Oakland University, Michigan
Ohio Northern University
Ohio State University
Old College, Georgia
Onondoga Community College, New York
Otterbein College, Ohio

Pace University, New York
Pacific Lutheran University, Washington
Park College, Kansas
Parkersburg Community College, West Virginia
Paul Quinn College, Texas
Pennsylvania State University
Penn Valley Community College, Kansas
Phoenix College, Arizona
Pima Community College, Arizona
Pitt Community College, North Carolina
Portland State University, Oregon
Providence College, Rhode Island

Queens College, North Carolina
Quinsigamond Community College, Massachusetts

Reed College, Oregon

Regis College, Massachusetts
Rhode Island College
Robert Morris College, Pennsylvania
Roberts Wesleyan College, New York
Rockhurst College, Kansas
Rutgers University, New Jersey
Rutledge College, North Carolina

Salem College, North Carolina
Salisbury State University, Maryland
Sampson Technical College, North Carolina
San Diego State University, California
San Francisco State University, California
Sangamon State University, Illinois
School for Field Studies, Massachusetts
Seattle Central Community College, Washington
Seattle Pacific University, Washington
Seton Hall University, New Jersey
Shenandoah College, Virginia
Shepherd's College, West Virginia
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
SHOWA Women's Institute, Massachusetts
Siena College, New York
Sierra University, California
Simmons College, Massachusetts
Skagit Valley College, Washington
Skidmore College, New York
Southampton College, New York
Southern Connecticut State University
Southeast Missouri State University
Southeastern Massachusetts University
Southwest Adventist College, Texas
Southwest Ohio Council on Higher Education
Southwestern College, California
Spelman College, Georgia
Spring Arbor College, Michigan
Spring Hill College, Alabama
St. Ambrose University, Iowa
St. Andrews College, North Carolina
St. Augustine's College, North Carolina
St. Cloud State University, Minnesota
St. Francis College, Pennsylvania
St. John Fisher College, New York
St. John's College, Maryland
St. John's University, Minnesota
St. Lawrence University, New York
St. Mary College, Kansas
St. Mary's College, California
St. Mary's College of Maryland
St. Michael's College, Vermont
St. Norbert College, Wisconsin
St. Olaf College, Minnesota
St. Paul's College, Virginia
St. Peter's College, New Jersey
Stanford University, California
State Technical Institute at Memphis, Tennessee
State University of New York-Binghamton
State University of New York-Brockport
State University of New York-Buffalo
State University of New York-College of Ceramics at Alfred
State University of New York-Cortland
State University of New York-Fredonia
State University of New York-Oswego
State University of New York-Plattsburgh
State University of New York-Purchase
Stephens College, Missouri
Stetson University, Florida
Stonehill College, Massachusetts
Suffolk Community College, New York
Suffolk University, Massachusetts
Susquehanna University, Pennsylvania
Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania
Sweet Briar College, Virginia
Syracuse University, New York

Technical College of Alamance, North Carolina
Temple University, Pennsylvania
Tennessee State University
Tennessee Technological University
Texas Christian University
Thiel College, Pennsylvania
Thomas More College, Kentucky
Towson State University, Maryland
Transylvania College, Kentucky
Trinity College, Connecticut
Tufts University, Massachusetts

Unity College, Maine
University of Alabama
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of Baltimore, Maryland
University of California-Berkeley
University of California-Davis
University of California-Irvine
University of California-Los Angeles
University of California-Riverside
University of California-San Diego
University of California-Santa Barbara
University of California-Santa Cruz
University of Cincinnati, Ohio

University of Colorado-Boulder
University of Delaware
University of Hawaii
University of Houston, Texas
University of Illinois
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Maine
University of Maryland-Eastern Shore
University of Maryland-University College
University of Massachusetts-Amherst
University of Massachusetts-Boston
University of Miami, Florida
University of Michigan
University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas
University of Nebraska
University of Nevada-Los Vegas
University of New Hampshire
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina-Charlotte
University of North Carolina-Greensboro
University of North Carolina-Wilmington
University of Northern Iowa
University of Notre Dame, Indiana
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of the Pacific, California
University of Phoenix, Arizona
University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
University of Puget Sound, Washington
University of Redlands, California
University of Rochester, New York
University of Rhode Island
University of Richmond, Virginia
University of San Diego, California
University of Scranton, Pennsylvania
University of Southern California
University of Tampa, Florida
University of Tennessee-Knoxville
University of Texas-Austin
University of Texas-El Paso
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Upsala College, New Jersey
Utah Valley Community College

Vanderbilt University, Tennessee
Vassar College, New York
Villanova College, Pennsylvania

Wake Forest University, North Carolina
Walla Walla College, Washington
Washington College, Maryland
Wayne Community College, North Carolina
Wayne State University, Michigan
Wellesley College, Massachusetts
Wells College, New York
Wesleyan University, Connecticut
Western Carolina University, North Carolina
Western Maryland College
Western Michigan University
Western Piedmont Community College, North Carolina
Western Washington University
West Chester University of Pennsylvania
Westmont College, California
West Virginia State College
Whatcom Community College, Washington
Wheaton College, Illinois
Wheaton College, Massachusetts
Wichita State University, Kansas
Widener University, Pennsylvania
Wilkes College, Pennsylvania
Wilkes Community College, North Carolina
Wingate College, North Carolina
Winston-Salem State University, North Carolina
Winthrop College, South Carolina
Wittenberg University, Ohio

Xavier University, Louisiana

Yakima Valley Community College, Washington
Yale University, Connecticut

SECONDARY SCHOOLS, CORPORATIONS, COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, AND OTHERS:

General Motors Corporation, Michigan
Highland High School, Idaho
Highland High School, Utah
INTERMEC, Inc., Washington
Provo School District, Utah
San Francisco University High School, California
United States Office of Personnel Management, DC
United Way of Grand Rapids, Michigan
Volunteer Clearinghouse of the District of Columbia

** The institutions listed here have participated in Model 1,2,3, or 4 of the NSIEE National Program. A few have participated in more than one model.